DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 439 759 EC 309 429

AUTHOR Osgood, Robert L.
TITLE Becoming a Special Educator: Specialized Professional Training for Teachers of Children with Disabilities in Boston, 1870-1930.
PUB DATE Apr 97
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; *Educational History; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Program Development; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Education Teachers; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *Boston Public Schools MA

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the ways in which individuals have been prepared for work in special education by focusing on the Boston, Massachusetts, public schools from 1870 through the 1920's. During this period, selected teachers and teacher candidates were recruited and prepared for specific assignments as instructors of children with disabilities. This paper looks at how teacher training practices varied from program to program and at how they evolved over time. Information is reviewed on minimum qualifications for applicants, course work and field experience requirements, expectations for personal and professional character and behavior, special opportunities for preservice and inservice training, and examinations and other modes of evaluation. The paper examines implicit and explicit assumptions and rationales that helped to define, explain, or justify these programs, while contrasting the programs with the training for regular classroom assignments. Ways in which various activities, including collaborative projects, or personal and collective statements of the participants, helped to create a sense of unique professional identity among those involved in special education are explored. Finally, the article discusses implications drawn from this research for current efforts to redefine the relationship between special and regular education and to reduce the tensions and boundaries between special and general educators. (Contains 33 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 408 758

Becoming a Special Educator: Specialized Professional Training for Teachers of Children with Disabilities in Boston, 1870-1930

Robert L. Osgood

Indiana University School of Education

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

EC 305 637

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The emergence of special education as a firmly entrenched arm of public schooling has constituted a remarkable story in the history of American education in the twentieth century. With an extensive body of professional literature as well as a number of professional associations devoted solely to special education issues, and with substantial numbers of individuals assigned full-time to schools as special education teachers, specialists, administrators, consultants, and researchers, the education of students with disabilities in many ways has become its own powerful and influential educational world, possessing a strong sense of unique professional identity and status. Special education's current situation is reflected in the dramatic growth of professional preparation programs over the past two decades dedicated exclusively to creating special educators who possess a wide range of specialist knowledge, developments which Dianne Ferguson refers to as "unremitting professionalization." "The established separateness of special education from regular education," she writes,

> is powerfully reinforced by the processes of professionalization and specialization that have occurred within the field. . . . From the beginning, special education responded to its charge to deal with regular education's rejected students by finding professional status in the stigma. Following the paths laid by other occupational groups seeking to transform work into profession, special educators developed a unique technical expertise, licensing procedures, professional organizations, and a separate lexicon with which to baffle consumers and nonspecial colleagues alike.[1]

Understanding how and why special education evolved to this point represents and exciting and important challenge for historians of education in the United States, especially in light of current calls to break down traditional

barriers between special education and regular (or general) education. The inclusion model for educating students with disabilities has gained tremendous momentum in recent years, fueled by federal and state legislation, scholarly research, and the efforts of advocacy groups. A fundamental tenet of inclusion is that boundaries between special education and regular education teachers and practices be de-emphasized, if not dissolved altogether--in other words, to move "beyond separate education" to fully inclusive, equitable learning environments for all students.[2] However, the compartmentalization and separation of special and regular educators complicates such efforts by reinforcing beliefs that the two camps do indeed constitute separate worlds that cannot or should not be merged. For historians of education, the opportunity exists to identify and understand the origins of and rationale behind this separation: when it began, what promoted its development, and why it has come to be so entrenched. Such investigations can provide important information and guidance for those who seek to transcend or overcome these barriers, perhaps leading to the formulation of effective strategies to integrate special education and regular education more completely and authentically.

One potentially instructive approach to examining this history is to consider the ways in which special educators have been recruited and trained to teach in the public schools. This line of inquiry assumes, as Ferguson argues, that the ways in which individuals have been prepared for work in special education have helped define the nature and status of that work as well as its relations with other components of public schooling. To examine these issues in some detail, this article will focus on the Boston, Massachusetts public schools from 1870 through the 1920s. During this sixty-year period the Boston public school system established a series of special classes, schools, and programs designed to accommodate children with a variety of formally identified

exceptionalities: hearing impairment, mental disability, chronic illness, giftedness, vision impairment, and speech disorders. Beginning with its Horace Mann School for the Deaf, established in 1869, and continuing through this diverse group of programs (all of which had begun by 1913), the Boston School Committee recruited and prepared selected teachers and teacher candidates for specific assignments as instructors of children with disabilities. Over several decades such training became more extensive and specialized; by the 1920s several hundred teachers in the system had been prepared to work exclusively with exceptional children and had developed a strong sense of professional identity with their work.

Specifically, this paper looks at how these training practices varied from program to program and at how they evolved over time, discussing information such as minimum qualifications for applicants, coursework and field experience requirements, expectations for personal and professional character and behavior, special opportunities for preservice and inservice training (including workshops and other activities), and examinations and other modes of evaluation. It examines implicit and explicit assumptions and rationales which helped define, explain, or justify these programs while contrasting them with the training for regular classroom assignments. It also explores how various activities, collaborative projects, or personal and collective statements of the participants helped create a sense of unique professional identity among those involved in special education. Finally, the article discusses implications drawn from this research for current efforts to redefine the relationship between special and regular education and to reduce the tensions and boundaries between special and general educators.

Professionalization of Teaching and Special Education in the Nineteenth Century

During the nineteenth century a number of substantial efforts were initiated to improve the quality and professionalism of elementary and secondary teachers in the United States. The number of teachers grew dramatically throughout the 1800s as an increasing population, the impact of the common school movement, and the advent of compulsory education all demanded more and more teachers for more and more schools. In the 1820s James G. Carter of Massachusetts lamented the quality of the teaching force in his state's town and rural district schools, arguing, in Jurgen Herbst's words, that "the road to improvement of the common schools led through a uniform system of teacher training and qualification . . . ask[ing] for what later generations would call professionalization." Massachusetts opened the first normal school, or institutions designed specifically to train teachers, in Lexington in 1839--the first formal step in the long road toward the professionalization of teachers in the United States.[3]

Over the next several decades hundreds of normal schools or other institutions involved in teacher training were established by city, county, or state governments in an attempt to bolster the ranks of qualified instructors available to teach in the public schools. By 1898 there were 167 public normal schools, and a slightly larger number of private normal schools, in all areas of the country. In addition, well over 100 colleges and universities offered courses or programs designed to prepare secondary school teachers as well as administrators, normal school instructors, and college faculty in education. Throughout this period and well into the early twentieth century, teacher training programs extended entrance requirements and increased the number and variety of courses required for program completion; certification requirements

moved from passing a local district examination to satisfying statewide standards demanding completion of accredited teacher education programs. During these several decades normal schools moved from one- or two-year programs at the secondary level to four year programs at the collegiate level. While the development of teacher education institutions and programs is a far more complex and problematic history than this brief sketch may suggest, the movement toward higher standards for a stronger professionalism among teachers in the United States was unmistakable.[4]

Another indication of attempts to bring greater professionalism to teaching was the rise of professional associations dedicated to improving the status and practice of teachers. Throughout the 1800s considerable numbers of local, regional, state, and national associations for teachers and others interested in education flourished. These associations included active and influential groups in larger cities such as New York and Boston; state teachers associations, seventeen of which existed and were highly active as early as 1856; and the National Teachers Association, later the National Education Association, founded in 1857. Through meetings, conferences, journals, and other modes of discourse and dissemination, these associations addressed a wide range of philosophical, political, and practical issues directly related to teaching and to the operation of public schools. As Wayne Urban demonstrates, particularly intense efforts related to enhancing the status and working conditions of teachers occurred during the early twentieth century.[5]

Within the context of strengthening the professionalism of teachers and teaching, special education began to emerge as a distinct and recognized subfield of education and teaching, with certain unique characteristics and interests. For most of the nineteenth century, the formal instruction of individuals with disabilities took place almost exclusively outside the bounds of public

schools, either privately at home or in private or state-sponsored institutions. Even so, the idea that individuals with disabilities--even severe ones--could be educated as well as "treated" or "cared for" gained much wider acceptance. Individuals such as Samuel Gridley Howe, Edouard Seguin, Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Hopkins and Edward Miner Gallaudet, Hervey Wilbur, J. B. Richards, and Isaac Kerlin initiated general campaigns as well as specific programs to advance the education of individuals with disabilities, especially those with blindness, deafness, and mental retardation. Numerous state and private institutions serving specific populations were founded during the 1800s and were by and large geared toward the education, and not the warehousing, of their attendees. The State School for the Deaf at Hartford (1817), the Perkins School for the Blind (1832), Wilbur's private facility at Barre, Massachusetts (1848), the Massachusetts School for Idiotic and Feeble-minded Youth (1851), and the Pennsylvania Training School (1852, later the Elwyn Institute) all gained international renown as leaders in the development of educational programs for individuals with disabilities during the nineteenth century.[6]

These individuals and institutions provided leadership in legitimizing the work of those who taught disabled persons. In addition they provided specialized training for the teachers who worked there and proved instrumental in establishing a number of professional organizations. Associations for teachers of the deaf (1850, 1890) and the blind (1853, 1871) were followed by the creation of the Department of Deaf, Blind, and Feeble-minded within the National Education Association in 1897. A primary purpose of this department was to "emphasize the importance of special training as a *sine qua non* to employment" as a teacher of "deaf children, blind children, and feeble-minded children, all of which classes require trained specialists for their instruction." The Department was designed to complement, not "interfere in any way" with, other

professional associations. In the words of a founding member of the department and its first president, Joseph C. Gordon, it aimed to "unify" existing organizations, "to harmonize their interests, and to bring their membership in closer touch with the leaders of educational thought and action in the National Education Association." In addition, professional journals such as those focusing on the education of the deaf (*American Annals of the Deaf and Dumb*, 1847) and the mentally retarded (*Journal of Psycho-Asthenics*, 1896) resulted from the determination of professionals to disseminate beyond their annual meetings information about advancements in "special education"--a term discussed in some detail by Alexander Graham Bell at the NEA meeting in Milwaukee in 1897 and firmly established with the renamed Department of Special Education of the NEA in 1902.[7]

By the turn of the century, however, special education no longer found itself restricted almost exclusively to private or institutional settings. As of 1900, the public school systems of at least eight major American cities had established at least one class, program, or school designed to accommodate children with formally identified disabilities. The notion of a highly trained public school special education teacher had entered professional discourse as well. For example, in a paper presented to the NEA in 1910, Charles A. A. J. Miller, an assistant superintendent with the Baltimore public schools, outlined ideal qualifications for his special education teachers. These included training in a "good normal school," basic coursework in a variety of liberal arts and education subjects, "five years of approved experience in the grades," and above all superlative "spiritual equipment." This eventual union of special education with public schooling constituted a most instructive confluence of reform movements in urbanization, psychology, social work, pedagogy, and educational administration. And the experience of one of these cities--Boston--

offers a most useful case study of how special educators moved their concerns for professional status into public education, laying an early foundation for the growth and entrenchment of a distinct, separate, special education structure and identity within the public schools of the United States by the late 1920s.[8]

Overview of the Boston Public Schools

The history of the Boston Public Schools officially began with the passage of an Education Act by the town of Boston in 1789. This Act formally outlined a public school system of reading and writing schools, provided guidelines for attendance, and established the Boston School Committee to oversee curriculum, budget, and general operations. Over the next several decades the public school system grew steadily in size and complexity, paralleling and reflecting the growth of the city itself. From a town of 18,320 in 1790, Boston developed into one of the great urban centers in the United States, boasting a population of 362,000 by 1880 and more than 781,000 by 1930. In 1790 about 600 children attended the town's public schools; by 1880 the system enrolled almost 54,000, and by 1930 about 129,000 students attended public schools in the city. This dramatic increase in school attendance reflected not only Boston's burgeoning population but also more extensive and more strictly enforced compulsory education laws, which the state of Massachusetts initiated in 1852 and strengthened repeatedly into the 1920s. Throughout this period the school system itself became a far more complex, rigid, and influential public bureaucracy, extending its scope and reach throughout the community and into large segments of the urban fabric.[9]

The Boston Public Schools' policies and practices also responded directly to another fundamental characteristic of this period: the dramatic diversification of the city's population. Through the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century, immigration into the city transformed a mostly Anglo

population to one which reflected the widespread migration of people from all over the world to the United States. The first sizable wave of immigration occurred between 1840 and 1860 and consisted primarily of people from Ireland. A second great wave began around 1880 and included immigrants from Europe, especially from its southern and eastern regions. As of 1920 almost half a million of the city's 670,000 residents were first or second generation immigrants. Boston had thus become a vibrant city of tremendous ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity by the 1920s, a condition which directly influenced the development of an enormous yet generally efficient system of public education in basic ways.[10]

As diversity came to characterize Boston's public schools in increasingly dramatic fashion, the Boston School Committee began to sanction the establishment of instructional settings which segregated certain groups of students from traditional schools and classrooms. Recognizing the challenges--and in many cases, manifesting the fears--which student heterogeneity generated, the BSC between 1838 and 1915 authorized a considerable number of specialized instructional settings, including evening schools, vacation schools, manual training programs, prevocational and vocational centers, classes for non-native English speaking children, and eventually entire tracks of industrial training and other curricular tracks at the upper elementary and secondary levels. [11]

Included among these differentiated settings were several designed to accommodate children whose academic performance, physical condition, or personal behavior was determined to preclude their participation in the regular classroom. Compulsory education and the social, cultural, and linguistic differences among the student population contributed to ever-rising numbers of school children who, in the eyes of teachers and administrators, fit that

description--especially as the process of schooling became more standardized and rigidified. As early as 1838 Boston had created intermediate schools (which later evolved into ungraded classes) designed to instruct older, mostly immigrant pupils with a primary education in segregated settings. The first formal setting established specifically to serve a small, distinctly labeled group of children--those with serious hearing impairments--opened in 1869 as the School for Deaf-Mutes (changed in 1877 to the Horace Mann School for the Deaf). As formal recognition of disabling conditions and beliefs espousing the educability of even children with severe disabilities filtered into the public schools, and as the public schools accepted more and more such children, Boston established additional special educational programs. A school for students who had violated truancy or other laws started in 1895; classes for children identified as mentally retarded began in 1899. Open-air classes for chronically ill children (1908), rapid advancement classes for gifted children (1912), speech improvement classes and centers (1912), and conservation of eyesight classes for children with vision impairments (1913) followed. By 1920 Boston thus had a noteworthy collection of programs geared toward children with formally identified exceptionalities. [12]

Teachers for Special Education Programs in Boston

The professionalization of the public school teaching force, the emergence of the notion of educability of individuals with disabilities, and expanding conceptions of who belonged in and could benefit from public schooling proceeded concurrently throughout the nation while finding a center of activity and acceptance in the Boston area. The region had served as the birthplace of formal teacher training, as the home of a number of institutions dedicated to educate individuals with disabilities, and as a leader in the development of compulsory education and of more efficient and

professionalized public school administration. The region's extensive and traditional influence in these movements seemed to naturally inform the Boston School Committee's uneven but ultimately substantial efforts to establish special education programs and staff them with competent, specially-trained teachers. The Committee's efforts in setting qualifications and training procedures for such teachers, and the activities of the teachers and administrators in envisioning, defining, and executing the specific qualities, expectations, and responsibilities of special education work reveal much about the sources as well as results of such efforts. Beginning with the School for Deaf-Mutes and continuing with varying degrees of commitment and success with other programs for students with identified disabilities, the Boston public schools slowly established an environment that helped build a sense of unique identity and professionalism among many of the teachers recruited to become special educators. Boston thus proved to be fertile ground for the emergence of special education as its own professional world.

The Horace Mann School for the Deaf

From its founding in 1869, the Horace Mann School for the Deaf (the name selected in 1877 to replace the original "School for Deaf-Mutes") epitomized the transplantation of special education knowledge and practice from isolated institutions to public schools. Established primarily as a means to provide more economical and convenient education for Boston's population of deaf children, the Horace Mann School (HMSD) paid close attention to the development and implementation of the latest theories, approaches, and techniques available for teaching deaf individuals. Even though the HMSD curriculum drew considerably on the standard curriculum used in the Boston public schools, the former in fact contained significant, substantial departures from and additions to the latter, requiring that teachers in the School be

carefully trained and frequently updated on new developments in curriculum and instruction for the deaf. The result was Boston's groundbreaking effort to develop trained special educators with a strong sense of identity with and pride in their specialized work.

The School's first principal, Sarah Fuller, sought early on to base the School's curriculum on the "oral" or "articulation" method, an approach not widely used in the sheltered institutions for the deaf but seen as much more appropriate for a day school in a system of public education. After attending a series of lectures by Alexander Neville Bell on his own oral method known as Visible Speech, Fuller convinced the Boston School Committee to appropriate $500 to have Bell's son, Alexander Graham Bell, train her teaching staff in the principles and methods of Visible Speech and to teach students at the School. Bell spent April and May of 1871 at the School; he was impressed with the students' lip-reading abilities, and Fuller and her staff were in turn impressed with Visible Speech. Fuller adopted it, and the Horace Mann School for the Deaf soon found itself at the forefront of deaf education in the United States. The oral approach continued to serve as the cornerstone of the HMSD curriculum into the 1930s, and teachers would continue to receive intensive training in it.[13]

Visible Speech was a complicated and demanding instructional method, and in combination with extensive use of the regular public school curriculum required a great deal of stamina, dedication, and patience on the part of the teachers. Boston school authorities agreed, officially at least, that successful members of the HMSD faculty needed special qualities and training over and above those of the typical public school teachers. In 1891 the Board of Supervisors for the Boston Public Schools explained that the Horace Mann teachers were "carefully selected from the best teachers in the other public

schools. They must be gentle, sympathetic, patient, firm, self-sacrificing, and devoted to their work; they must possess good sense, tact, and skill; they must know the principles of education and the best methods of teaching." Once selected, a new Horace Mann teacher became a pupil under the tutelage of Sarah Fuller, who would train the new teacher "in the special act of teaching the deaf. After years of experience, they become expert in this art; and were they to resign their places, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to fill their vacancies." In 1890 a speaker at the dedication of the new Horace Mann School building on Newbury Street proclaimed that "the progress made in this institution . . . is due to the patient and persevering toil of a band of teachers, who merit our warmest commendation . . . ." The Boston School Committee discussed at length the problems teachers faced in the school, noting that Visible Speech demanded much more of a teacher's energy than did the signing method. They had to pay extremely close attention to mistakes of students and work very hard to form their own sounds perfectly. They needed to show both "great patience and enthusiasm" in often repetitious work and a thorough knowledge of "Vocal Physiology." Teaching of the deaf, according to the Committee, also demanded an "accurate ear" and "tact . . . to keep up the children in what to them is too often mere drudgery."[14]

As principal, Sarah Fuller kept the school at the center of professional activity related to education of the deaf. In addition to effective leadership within the Horace Mann School, Fuller participated in the formation of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf and the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf. Fuller also proved instrumental in the education of Helen Keller, who attended the School in the early 1890s in order to receive training in oral instruction.[15]

Fuller's active professional participation from the local to the national level certainly enhanced the sense of professional identity and pride which became an ingrained characteristic of the Horace Mann School culture. The School's teaching staff was the first organized group of teachers in the Boston public schools to receive highly specialized training in a specific pedagogy. Expectations regarding their superior teaching skills and personal character were set high from the beginning, and the School consistently employed a challenging curriculum whose successful execution demanded much of teachers as well as students. Given the nature of the School's charge and position, though, such developments were not surprising. Its proximity to the internationally known American School for the Deaf in Hartford, Connecticut and the relatively advanced state of knowledge concerning hearing impairments and pedagogy designed for deaf students certainly worked to the School's advantage and facilitated Boston's efforts to provide the most effective, up-to-date instruction for this group of students. Eventually, students identified as having other specific disabilities would benefit from programs offering similar expectations and preparations for teachers in the Boston public schools--though these would arise decades after the founding of the Horace Mann School.

Special Classes for the Mentally Retarded

Between 1899 and 1930 the Boston public schools experienced tremendous development in its provisions for students identified as mentally retarded. Following the lead of other cities, most notably Providence, Rhode Island, Boston established its first "special class" in the Franklin School in the city's South End in 1899. During the first twelve years of their existence, the number of special classes grew slowly. Beginning in 1912, however, the Boston School Committee began a dramatic expansion in the number of these classes

as well as in the amount of effort and support put into them. During that year about twenty classes for more than 200 students had either been authorized or were under way; by 1930, 135 special classes accommodated just under 2,000 children. These included individual classes in regular schools as well as classes found in the six major special class centers located throughout the city. To oversee this growth a Supervisor of Special Classes was appointed in 1912; by 1930 a Department of Special Classes, with both a Director and Assistant Director, had become firmly entrenched. Additionally, from their inception the special classes were identified as settings which, like the Horace Mann School, required a corps of dedicated, capable, specially trained teachers exhibiting great personal strength and character. Consequently, special class teachers were subject to higher expectations regarding personal and professional qualities and benefited from unique training programs and support services which clearly distinguished the special class teacher from her regular classroom colleagues.[16]

As viewed by administrators and other observers, the requisite qualities of a special class teacher resembled those of teachers in the Horace Mann School. In terms of personality, observer David Lincoln argued, "it is held that good sense, sympathy, tact, motherliness and energy are of the first importance." Ada Fitts, a special class teacher and first Supervisor of Special Classes, elaborated on these qualifications, saying that the instructor "must be one whose sympathies are keen and whose outlook is broad, but who combines with these gifts, steadiness of purpose and the power to raise and hold her pupil to his best. A sense of humor will help out in many a situation." Professionally, special class teachers needed to be "wise and accomplished," with a sound knowledge of kindergarten teaching methods. They should know not only "how much freedom can safely be given the child," but also his or her

limitations, and they should have training "along universal lines of pedagogy" as well as an awareness of "the heart of the child." Special class teachers also had to be able to act independently and use their best judgment consistently while demonstrating skill "in the recognition of remedial defect." According to a special class curriculum manual, "the supreme need of one who would teach or train a little child is the power to put oneself in his place--to go as far as the actual point of meeting with his actual need . . . [to] link her strength to her pupils' weakness, her knowledge to his ignorance, her skill to his lack of skill."[17]

To ensure a sufficient supply of competent special class teachers, the Boston School Committee and the various superintendents mandated a variety of teacher training programs. Elizabeth Daniels, the teacher for the first special class in Boston, had participated in training exercises for teachers of the mentally deficient, either (the records are ambiguous) at Hervey Wilbur's private institution in Barre, Massachusetts or at the Seguin School operated by Eduoard Seguin's widow. In March 1902 the BSC approved a general leave of absence, for a maximum of a year with pay and travel expenses, to five grammar and primary school teachers for training in teaching "mentally defective, or backward children" at The School for Feeble-minded Children in Elwyn, Pennsylvania. Two months later the Committee approved Superintendent Edwin Seaver's visit to that same institution to evaluate the program and meet with its director, Dr. Martin Barr. Although Barr was at first "appalled" at Seaver's request to send teachers to train, he accepted "on condition that I could have them under my absolute control and could have women of cultivation and refinement." He then noted that Seaver "sent me most delightful women in every way, earnest, thoughtful, capable, hard workers." Barr gave the teachers "clinics" and taught them sloyd as well as other kinds of manual training over a period of three months. Other teachers were sent to the

Seguin School, the private institution at Barre, or the Massachusetts state school for the mentally retarded at Waverley. The Waverley institution not only provided training but also assisted in the development of the early special classes, with teachers of the first eight special classes receiving such training. The purpose, according to Seaver, was to guarantee the "steady success of the special classes" by offering intensive specialized instruction "to some of the ablest young teachers now in the city's service" who would then be "*promoted* to the special classes" (emphasis in the original).[18]

An additional step in developing well-qualified special class teachers was the introduction of awarding special class certificates to qualified applicants. In 1904 four candidates applied for teacher certificates for "special classes for the feeble-minded." Through the first decade of the twentieth century the use of such certificates grew slowly as the number of classes remained small. When that number began to jump, the BSC authorized the temporary transfer of uncertified instructors to special classes while they worked to obtain special class certification. By 1913 school regulations specified certificate requirements as "one year's successful experience in teaching a class of mentally defective children," or a year's experience assisting in a Boston special class, or two years experience teaching regular classes together with the "successful completion of a course for teachers of mentally defective children, approved by the board of superintendents." Teachers at the special class centers needed "three years successful experience in teaching and governing a class of mentally defective children." Later requirements included possession of a high school diploma or its equivalent. Certification also involved examinations in a variety of subjects including special class philosophy and methodology as well as knowledge of other elements of the special class curriculum. As the number of special classes grew, so did the

number of certificates awarded. These were valid for one to six years depending on the examinee's performance.[19]

For its practicing special class teachers, the Boston school system also implemented a number of in-service programs designed to enhance teacher skills as well as create forums for discussion and mutual support. In 1912 the BSC budgeted $200 for "a course of lectures to teachers of special classes on 'The Teaching of Backward Children,'" leading to a series of talks by Yale psychologist Arnold L. Gesell. Late in 1914 the BSC passed an order requesting "the Superintendent to prepare and submit a plan for the training of teachers for classes of mentally defective children." The result was a course begun in January 1915 consisting of a clinic at the state institution in Waverley, lectures by Waverley superintendent and renowned expert Dr. Walter E. Fernald on the "psychology and pedagogy of the special child," additional coursework on manual and household arts, and inservice practice and evaluation offered by veteran Boston special class teachers and the supervisor for the Department of Special Classes. The extensive course also included visits to the homes of special class students. An additional program, budgeted at $100 by the BSC in September 1916, offered short courses on "The Diagnosis and Treatment of Individual Differences" and "Problems of Individual Adjustments in Child Life" given by Drs. William Healy and Augusta Bonner. The superintendent lauded this program as "highly beneficial." It is important to note, however, that not until the early 1930s did the city's teacher training institution, The Teachers College of the City of Boston, offer any coursework in special class instruction.[20]

In addition to courses and lectures the BSC encouraged special class teachers to participate in professional visitations, conferences, and associations on local, regional, and national levels. Teachers would on occasion visit each

other's classrooms to observe and advise. Certain Friday afternoons were set aside for not only lectures but also conferences and other group discussions. Usually led by the special class supervisor, these sessions covered a wide range of subjects, including career placement for special class children; academic vs. manual work; home visits; after-school and follow-up care; physical, manual, and sense training; and reports on special class work in other cities and countries. Superintendent Franklin Dyer wrote that "for teachers engaged in what would otherwise seem to be discouraging work such conferences are of great value," helping to give Boston's special class teachers a "high order of professional spirit." These conferences proved quite popular in the mid 1910s, although it is not clear from the records how long they continued. Nevertheless, discussion among the city's special class instructors remained vibrant, leading to collaboration on a nationally popular curriculum manual and the formation of a Special Class Teacher's Club by the mid 1920s. In addition, the School Committee facilitated participation in professional conferences. It approved leaves of absence for several teachers to attend the 1911 National Conference of Charities and Correction, and it financed Ada Fitts' presentation before that same organization in 1916. Finally, in the late 1920s, Massachusetts began sponsoring regional conferences for all the state's special class teachers. Programs included lectures by professionals, demonstrations by special class students, and reports from teachers. By the early 1930s attendance at these conferences, which Boston often hosted, numbered in the several hundreds.[21]

The unique work of special class teachers, and the extent to which they identified with each other professionally in the context of that work, is best exemplified by their collaboration on a special class curriculum manual, *The Boston Way: Plans for the Development of the Individual Child.* The basis for

this manual was a 79-page "Syllabus for Special Classes," first published as Boston School Document # 4 in 1914. That syllabus listed thirty different areas of special class work covering a wide range of topics, projects, materials, games, and assorted other activities. The fourth edition of *The Boston Way*, published by the Special Class Teachers Club in 1928, listed over forty subject headings from academics to manual training to recreation activities, all of which were discussed in great detail. *The Boston Way* gained a national reputation as a thorough, useful guide for special class teachers throughout the country. The teachers disclosed that their work did not represent a single, unified curriculum: "While no single class attempted all the work outlined in this syllabus, in the aggregate it was covered by their combined work." Ada Fitts added that the syllabus was "an attempt to show the lines of work which may be followed rather than to lay down a course of study. Classes vary so widely in age, mentality, social conditions and nationality that the syllabus can only be suggestive." Even so, *The Boston Way* reflected a strong concern on the part of Boston's special class teachers to disseminate their work to a wider audience and solidify their emerging professional identity.[22]

Clearly, being a special class teacher in Boston involved accepting that growing sense of professional identity as an instructor of the mentally retarded in the public schools, an identity at least as strong as that among the regular teaching corps--perhaps even stronger, given their own belief and the apparent belief of others that their work was particularly challenging. The energy and enthusiasm demonstrated in the initial preparation, frequent revision, and widespread dissemination of the special class syllabus, as well as in the participation in clubs, conferences, and other professional activities, reflected the pride and dedication which the city's special class teachers possessed. This sense of pride and identity was perhaps best expressed in an article attributed

to Ada Fitts but in fact put together by a group of special class teachers which appeared in the *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics*, a leading journal for professionals in the field of mental retardation. It discussed with obvious confidence the benefits that special class work was seen to be having on Boston's students, schools, and community, earning it a respected place in the Boston public school system. Their provocative, almost rosy self-assuredness is easily seen in the following passage:

> The attitude of children entering the Special Classes is often sullen, resentful and discouraged. These children gradually become happy, helpful units in humanity's whole. No miracle has been performed! The very name Special Class explains the reason for this seemingly miraculous change.[23]

Professionalization in other Special Education Programs, 1908-1930

Between 1908 and 1930 the Boston School committee authorized a series of other specialized instructional settings designed to serve students with a variety of formally identified exceptionalities. Open-air classes for chronically ill children (particularly those with tuberculosis) commenced in 1908, but since the standard curriculum was followed--if at a slower pace--little if any effort to provide specific, extensive training to teachers working in these settings was made. This held true for the rapid advancement classes, organized for students who were thought capable of mastering the standard curriculum more quickly: no special teacher training or support was deemed necessary, or provided. And with the exception of an added emphasis on discipline and manual training, administrators in charge of the Boston Parental School did not see teaching in that school as being significantly different from teaching in regular classrooms, and thus provided no additional training for those teachers. Two other programs, however--conservation of eyesight classes for children with vision

impairments, and speech improvement classes and centers for children with formally diagnosed speech disorders--did offer specialized training and support for their particular programs.

Conservation of eyesight classes began as classes for the "semi-blind" in 1913. While the number of students enrolled in this program stayed quite low--never reaching more than 167--a rigorous approach to training its teachers was adopted early on. The first two teachers for these classes were hired on the recommendation of the Perkins Institute for the Blind (the leading American institution for the blind, located in the Boston area), but gradually school officials drew instructors from the ranks of the city's regular teacher corps. By 1927 all the classes' teachers had regular classroom experience. To keep themselves abreast of developments in the treatment of partially blind children, the conservation of eyesight instructors took outside courses, read professional literature (some published by members of their ranks), and joined the Massachusetts Conservation of Eyesight Society. This organization worked to promote, according to Assistant Superintendent Augustine L. Rafter, "a fine, professional, cooperative spirit among the teachers." Moreover, by 1917 the teachers had begun "a series of meetings designed to place at the disposal of all what each individual may have learned. . . . Comparison of methods, admissions of full or partial failures . . . expositions of trials that point to probable successes . . . all of these and more have been discussed and the teachers have 'got together.'" Like other teachers of special programs for children with disabilities, conservation of eyesight instructors took pride in their work, delivered a complex curriculum specially tailored to their students' condition, and strove for cooperation and mutual support.[24]

The speech improvement program, consisting first of individual classes but later including entire centers, grew rapidly, becoming by the 1920s the

single largest program serving students with an identified disability. Speech improvement work addressed the physiological and mechanical problems associated with speech pathology as well as the psychological and behavioral difficulties which teachers believed accompanied speech problems. "Modern medicine claims to have demonstrated that defective speech is at bottom a pathological condition," declared Augustine Rafter. "The pupils. . . must be made to feel at home and at their ease. The very first and an indispensable element in any course . . . is the establishment of confidence between teacher and pupils." The supervisor of the speech classes, Theresa Dacey, agreed, saying in 1924 that speech teachers "must deal with grave causes, deep-rooted and far-reaching . . . ." She expressed concern that available methods of speech defect prevention among students were not being used enough in the regular classes to keep children from needing the program in the first place. Superintendent Jeremiah Burke advocated an all-encompassing curriculum and pedagogy which would free these children "from the bugbear of isolation, ridicule, and retardation."[25]

Naturally, school officials asserted that speech improvement work demanded highly skilled teachers. They looked for individuals who were thought to have the experience and temperament for such work. Dacey's ideal speech teacher possessed "geniality, sympathy, patience and ingenuity to deal with the sensitive, discouraged, fearful type. . . ." She argued that the successful teacher would employ "art and tact" in coping with the individual requirements of every child. Prospective teachers also needed to have "sufficient musical education to be enabled to play the piano and to discriminate the different voice defects of any candidate." Experience supervising playgrounds, coursework or experience in oral and dramatic expression, and a knowledge of literature constituted other desirable traits. Above all, instructors had to have sufficient

energy to handle a demanding schedule as well as large numbers of children. In 1914 each teacher worked with about eighty students; ten years later speech teachers on the average provided weekly instruction in small groups to 134 children with a range of defects. Almost every teacher in the program came from the ranks of the Boston teacher corps; this was as true in 1930 as 1914.[26]

Once recruited, the novice instructor trained in the mechanics and treatment of speech disabilities at one of the centers, presumably from other teachers or the supervisor. After training the teacher benefited from occasional in-service and mutual support programs much like those enjoyed by special class teachers. By 1917 instructors had organized a "round table . . . for the furtherance of speech correction." Meetings took place monthly and included discussion on such items as the waiting list for the classes, follow-up information on discharged students, transfers and adjustments of teaching positions, and "discussions on problems of common interest." Courses were also offered to improve particular teaching skills, for example in oral and dramatic art. An extended twenty-lesson course was offered on Friday afternoons in 1917 by the president of the College of the Spoken Word, Delbert Staley. Boston's speech instructors also passed along some of their knowledge by giving "very freely of their time and experience to the teachers of suburban towns . . . ." The consequence of this training and support was, in the words of one observer, "a remarkable spirit and enthusiasm" among the corps. In 1924 Theresa Dacey confidently declared that "the excellency of our teacher corps" could assume direct responsibility for "the steady, progressive growth and marked success of the speech improvement classes . . . ."[27]

Professional Identity and Involvement as a Special Educator: Opportunities and Limitations

The standards for training and certification for the regular teacher corps in the Boston public schools became increasingly demanding throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries, exemplifying the nationwide move toward the increased professionalization of teaching. Even so, teachers in the programs for students with disabilities not only met the standard qualifications but also satisfied additional ones related to their specific work. Far from soley being mere warehouses or dumping grounds, these instructional settings established some of the strongest professional expectations for personal character and professional skills for teachers of any subject at any level and attested to the seriousness with which the schools viewed that work. It is true that Boston's experience also suggests the limits of such professionalization: no general perception of being a "special educator" emerged until later, as teachers tended to identify much more closely with a specific program area than with the general concept of special education; and teachers working with certain groups of children whose disability was at the time poorly defined or lacking in a specific, unique pedagogy received little if any special support in terms of training or professional development. Nevertheless, these developments in Boston can help explain the origins of the tension and distinctions between special educators and regular educators which exist to a significant extent today.

One notable feature of all these programs was the expressed belief that only teachers of the highest personal and professional caliber should teach in them. Constantly proclaiming the need for intelligent, patient, tireless, caring, dedicated, highly competent persons to staff these special programs, school authorities suggested--defensively, perhaps--that the work was as challenging as it was important. The message to the teachers selected and to the public, at

least on the surface, was one of respect and support for their efforts with children who had at best dubious reputations in terms of background and/or educability. Notions of a strong community of teachers--of a certain "esprit de corps"--were reinforced, at least to some degree, by such proclamations. Still, the ultimate effect of these officially expressed sentiments on building a sense of unique professional identity among these teachers is uncertain. School authorities were quite liberal in assigning similar desired qualities to all teachers, not just those in special programs. Boston school officials doubtless wished and believed that these qualities could be readily found amongst the regular teachers in the public schools; they certainly wanted the general public to believe so. In addition, other instructional settings--most notably the intermediate schools and their successors, the ungraded classes (which offered instruction to a highly diverse group of troubled, struggling, mostly immigrant students through the 19th and into the 20th century) and the Boston Parental School (later the Boston Disciplinary Day School) for truant and other "delinquent" students--were also identified as settings needing the best teachers of the highest character and ability. However, those calls were never translated into practice, as these settings perpetually struggled to recruit and retain capable teachers for their classrooms. Expressed expectations and desires for sound character and training among teachers in a particular setting thus did not guarantee for those settings the assignment of teachers exhibiting strong professional and personal qualities.[28]

Participation in professional organizations and discourse proved considerably more telling in establishing a sense of professional identity among the teachers in these programs. Teachers at the Horace Mann School and those assigned to special classes, conservation of eyesight classes, and the speech improvement program all organized regular meetings to discuss

professional concerns and opportunities related to their particular work. Sarah Fuller and the Horace Mann School assumed national and even international leadership in advancing the cause of oral instruction for the deaf; conservation of eyesight teachers were active participants in their statewide professional society; speech improvement teachers conducted professional discussions with teachers engaged in similar work in other regional school districts. The Special Class Teachers Club not only produced a special class curriculum used throughout the country but also played a crucial role in planning and executing numerous important professional conferences. The Boston School Committee regularly supported such activities, providing leave opportunities and funding for attendance and presentations at professional meetings. Through these activities each group of teachers engaged in substantive activities which helped them articulate, define, and draw on important issues in their own specialized professional area.

Of greatest significance in the emergence of professional identity among these groups of special educators was the extensive, specialized training they received in the nature and pedagogy of students with disabilities. Each of these programs made arrangements with either experts or leading institutions in their particular area--usually with both. The lectures, courses, workshops, discussion groups, and other pre-service and in-service programs steeped the teachers in the exclusive knowledge and instructional methodology of their select field, providing advanced, unique training not available to, or expected of, the vast corps of regular classroom teachers. Their involvement with scholars and centers of learning served to connect more directly developments in special education--traditionally located in institutions and in private research--with the work of the public schools. By the 1920s literally hundreds of Boston schoolteachers had intensively engaged information, ideas, and instructional

techniques which previously had belonged almost exclusively to a select group of instructors in private practice or in the institutions. As a result, they were drawn into specialized circles which naturally developed within them a positive sense of focused, professional identity beyond that as a public school teacher.

Interestingly, that professional identity apparently did not extend to a generalized one as a special educator, at least in Boston, until well after 1930. As noted earlier, Alexander Graham Bell had referred to "special education" in his talk before the NEA in 1897; the NEA organized its Department of Deaf, Blind, and Feeble-minded that same year; reference to a National Association for the Study and Education of Exceptional Children was made at least as early as 1914; and the International Council for the Education of Exceptional Children (later the Council for Exceptional Children) was established in 1922. Even so, teachers involved in what is now termed "special education" in the Boston public schools identified themselves much more closely with their own particular category of disability. There is little evidence of significant, formal cross-fertilization of teachers in these various sub fields, and through the 1920s there was no centralized administrative department uniting these various programs (in fact, a 1944 report on the Boston school system laments the lack of just such a coordinating administrative agency). The specific training and professional involvement of these teachers likely focused their associations and dedication with others holding closely related, if not identical, interests; each of these areas carried a specific disability label which defined the parameters of their work and represented their shared professional concerns. This period thus witnessed the development of certain groups of teachers in the Boston schools--those teaching children carrying formal labels of disability--who considered their work to be substantially different from that of the regular corps of teachers,

but also different enough among themselves to merit primary identification with their unique corner of a generalized special education.[29]

Professional identity with specific categories of disability continues to this day. While umbrella organizations like the Council for Exceptional Children and the Special Education Research special interest group of the American Educational Research Association work to unite all special educators in a sense of common purpose and shared agendas, the multitude of organizations representing professionals in specific disability categories as well as separate areas or programs found in special education departments at colleges and universities work to reinforce primary involvement and identification with these smaller groups. But whatever the locus of identification, the perception that knowledge and pedagogy related to the education of students with disabilities constitutes a substantively unique, separate body of information--a perception deeply entrenched in history and practice, as the Boston experience demonstrates--is a fact of life in educational institutions today which interferes with efforts to move beyond the separation of special education and regular education. Overcoming this tradition of separation will be no easy task, nor should it be seen as a given, or even necessarily appropriate: professional identity of this sort has played a significant role in developing respect for the work of special educators and in strengthening knowledge, understanding, and method among teachers of children with disabilities. The extent and value of professional identity in special education thus must be recognized, accepted, and respected. Transcending this separation, then, requires working with rather than trying to squelch this tradition of primary professional association as an educator of children with disabilities. By recognizing the value of such specialized knowledge and practice, any planning toward greater integration and sense of mutual mission among special and general educators can

emphasize the need for all educators to participate in the activities and discourse related to effective education of exceptional children.

Alexander Graham Bell and William Torrey Harris, two of the most notable educators of the nineteenth century, spoke to this issue before the NEA in 1902. Bell called for closer "contact and affiliation" in order to "secure an interchange of ideas between those engaged in general and those engaged in special education." Harris "enter[ed] heartily" into Bell's vision, arguing that closer connections between teachers in regular and special education settings would be of "mutual benefit . . . to special and general teachers alike." Similar constructive cooperation today could energize and facilitate the efforts of educators working toward the equitable education of every child while providing a rationale and an agenda for each and every educator to construct their professional identity as broadly as possible. In turn of the century Boston, teachers preparing for work with children with disabilities shared a knowledge base with the regular teacher corps, affirming a tradition of differentiated bodies of knowledge for their supposedly different work. Perhaps a reconsideration of what a common knowledge base among all teachers should consist of--namely, one which includes extensive engagement with information and skills previously categorized as and thus limited to special education--can help bring all teachers together in a more authentically shared professional identity: that of a teacher of all children, each of whom has unique educational needs. By expanding the access to a previously cloistered professional world, traditions of separation and distance born in places such as Boston, yet condemned by the likes of Bell, Harris, and contemporary critics, can be more effectively transcended--to the potential benefit of all concerned.[30]

[1] Dianne Ferguson, "Severity of Need and Educational Excellence: Public School Reform and Students with Disabilities," in *Schooling and Disability*, eds. Douglas Biklen, Dianne L. Ferguson, & Alison Ford (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1989), 49-50. See also Jerry Whitworth and Richard Hatley, "Certification and Special Education Leadership Personnel: An Analysis of State Standards," *Journal of Special Education* 13 (Fall 1979): 297-305.

[2] D. K. Lipsky and A. Gartner, Eds., *Beyond Separate Education: Quality Education for All* (Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, 1983).

[3] Jurgen Herbst, *And Sadly Teach: Teacher Education and Professionalization in American Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1989), 30.

[4] Willard S. Elsbree, *The American Teacher: Evolution of a Profession in a Democracy* (New York: American Book Company, 1939), 312-313, 320; see also Herbst, *And Sadly Teach, passim*; Merle Borrowman, *The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1956); Donald Warren, Ed., *American Teachers: History of a Profession At Work* (New York: Macmillan, 1989). For a general discussion of the widespread construction of the notion of professionalism in the United States, see Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1976).

[5] Elsbree, *The American Teacher*, 241-270; Wayne Urban, "Teacher Activism," in *American Teachers*, ed. Donald Warren, 190-197.

[6] General discussions of the development of special education in the nineteenth century include Leo Kanner, *A History of the Care and Study of the Mentally Retarded* (Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas, 1964); R.C. Scheerenberger, *A History of Mental Retardation* (Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1983); and Margret Winzer, *The History of Special Education: From Isolation to Integration* (Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press, 1993).

[7] Margret Winzer, *The History of Special Education*, 225-230, 334-335; *Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association*, 36th Annual Meeting, 1897, 36-37, 96; *Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA*, 41st Annual Meeting, 1902, 828. For a discussion of the roles of departments in the NEA, see Edgar Wesley, *NEA: First Hundred Years: The Building of the Teaching Profession* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 274-291.

[8] Charles Miller, "What Kind of Qualifications and Training Should the Teacher of the Special Class Have?", *Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA*, 48th Annual Meeting, 1910, 1061-1066.

[9] [Author reference], *History of Special Education in Boston to 1945* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1989), 54-55; Michael Katz, *Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America* (New York: Praeger, 1971).

[10] General discussions of immigration's impact on Boston can be found in Oscar Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants 1790-1865: A Study in Acculturation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941); and Stephan Thernstrom, *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis 1880-1970* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).

[11] Marvin Lazerson, *Origins of the Urban School: Public Education in Massachusetts, 1870-1915* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971); "Chronology of the Boston Public Schools," in *47th Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document # 7, 1929.

[12] "Chronology," 99-117.

[13] John D. Philbrick, "23rd Semi-Annual Report of the Superintendent," September 1871, in *ARBSC*, 1871, 205-206; "Report of Committee on School for Deaf-Mutes," in *ARBSC*, 1873, 282-283. These developments are also discussed briefly in Ruth E. Bender, *The Conquest of Deafness: A History of the Long Struggle to Make Possible Normal Living to Those Handicapped by Lack of Hearing*, 3d ed. (Cleveland: Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1970), 98-103, 143, 147 and Edward L. Scouten, *Turning Points in the Education of Deaf People* (Danville, IL: Interstate Publishers and Printers, 1984), 63-65.

[14] "Report of the Board of Supervisors," in *Annual Report of the Boston School Committee*, 1891, 273; Henry Washburn, cited in the "Annual Report of the Horace Mann School for the Deaf," in *ARBSC*, 1890, Appendix 290; *ARBSC*, 1874, 470-471.

[15] E. L. Scouten, *Turning Points in the Education of Deaf People*, 222-223; *ARBSC*, 1903, Appendix 100.

[16] For data sources as well as a detailed discussion of these developments see [author reference], *History of Special Education in the Boston Public Schools to 1945*, 245-252.

[17] David Lincoln, "Special Classes for Mentally Defective Children in the Boston Public Schools," *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics* 14 (1909/1910), 91; Ada Fitts, "How to Fill the Gap between the Special Classes and Institutions," *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics* 20 (1915/1916), 80; Ada Fitts, "The Value of Special Classes for the Mentally Defective Pupils in the Public Schools," *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics* 25 (1920/1921), 117, 119; David Lincoln, "Special Classes for Feeble-Minded Children in the Boston Public Schools," *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics* 7 (1902/1903), 84; "Report of the Director of Special Classes," Appendix L to *58th Annual Report of the Superintendent* of the Boston Public Schools, 1920, 114;

Special Class Teachers of Boston, *The Boston Way: Plans for the Development of the Individual Child*, 4 ed. (Boston: Special Class Teachers Club, 1928), 4.

[18] Lincoln, 1902/1903, 84; *Proceedings of the Boston School Committee*, 1902, 145-146, 227; Martin Barr, cited in Lincoln, 1902/1903, 90; Lincoln, 1909/1910, 89, 92; 22nd *Annual Report of the Superintendent*, in *ARBSC*, 1902, 55-56.

[19] *ARBSC*, 1904, Appendix 118; BSC *Proceedings*, 1911, 131-132; BSC *Proceedings*, 1913, 169; BSC *Proceedings*, 1915, 169, 178; *36th Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document # 23, 1917, 74. On Boston certification examinations see for example Boston Public Schools, Board of Superintendents, *Examination Papers*, 1926, Nos. 239-242; other years of this publication also list such exams. Information on the yearly number of qualifiers for special class certificates can be found in the annual school document entitled "Candidates Eligible for Appointment as Teachers."

[20] BSC *Proceedings*, 1912, 214; *32nd Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document # 10, 1913, 62; BSC *Proceedings*, 1914, 166; *34th Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document # 17, 1915, 66; 33rd *Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document #11, 1914, 35; BSC *Proceedings*, 1917, 161-162; *36Annual Report of the Superintendent*,1917, 36; *49th Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document # 7, 1931, 25.

[21] BSC *Proceedings*, 1911, 147; *ARBSC*, 1911, 40; *34ARS*, 66-67; *32ARS*, 12-13; *43rd Annual Report of the Superintendent*, School Document # 9, 1925, 70; BSC *Proceedings*, 1911, 73; BSC *Proceedings*, 1916, 4; *Annual Report of the Massachusetts State Board of Education*, 1928, Part I 54-55. Information on these conferences for succeeding years is available in Part I of *ARSBE* for the respective years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[22] "Syllabus for Special Classes," School Document # 4, 1914, especially 3-5; Special Class Teachers of Boston, *The Boston Way*, *passim*; Ada Fitts, cited in "Report of Assistant Superintendent Walter S. Parker," Appendix to *53rd ARS*, 1914, 106. See also *36th ARS*, 1917, 36.

[23] Ada Fitts, 1920/1921, *passim*, especially 117.

[24] Enrollment data drawn from the *Annual Statistics of the Boston Public Schools*, 6, for each year; *45th Annual Report of the Superintendent*, 53; "Report of Assistant Superintendent Augustine L. Rafter," 1927, 197-198; "Report of Assistant Superintendent Augustine L. Rafter," 1917, 93.

[25] "Report of Assistant Superintendent Augustine L. Rafter," 1917, 94; "Report of the Assistant in Charge of Speech Improvement Classes, Miss Theresa A. Dacey," in *42nd ARS*, School Document # 17, 1924, 179-180; *45thARS*, 53.

[26] "Report of the Assistant in Charge of Speech Improvement Classes . . ." 180-181, 184; *45th ARS*, 51-52; "Report of Assistant Superintendent Walter S. Parker," 1914, 108, 110.

[27] *36th ARS*, 38; "Report of Assistant Superintendent Augustine L. Rafter," 1917, 96; *45th ARS*, 52; BSC *Proceedings*, 1917, 48, 208; *36th ARS*, 39; "Report of the Assistant in Charge of Speech Improvement Classes . . ." 1924, 181.

[28] For more on the intermediate schools and ungraded classes, see [author reference], "Undermining the Common School Ideal: Intermediate Schools and Ungraded Classes in Boston, 1838-1900," *History of Education Quarterly* (in press). For more on these and on the Boston Parental/Disciplinary Day School, open-air classes, and rapid advancement classes, see [author reference], *History of Special Education in Boston to 1945*, Chs. 4, 5, and 9.

[29] With reference to the NASEEC, see Maximilian Grossmann, "The Work of the National Association for the Study and Education of Exceptional Children,"

Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA, 52nd Annual Meeting, 1914, 843-844; Boston Finance Commission, *Report of A Survey of the Public Schools of Boston, Massachusetts* (Boston: Boston Finance Commission, 1944), 528.

[10] *Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA*, 41st Annual Meeting, 1902, 829-830.